1

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

to Join FFD Ventures, LP ("Ventures") as a counterclaim plaintiff (#17). FFD4 and Ventures filed a Response (#50) to Bancroft's objections.

This matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge for final determination pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IB 1-3 of the Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. Pursuant to § 636(b)(1)(A), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and Local Rule IB 3-1, a district judge may reconsider a magistrate judge's determination of such a pretrial matter where is has been shown that the magistrate judge's order is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." The court has conducted its review in this case and has fully considered Bancroft's objections, FFD4 and Ventures' response, and the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record. The court determines that the Magistrate Judge's order of September 29, 2011 granting joinder (#41) is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, and that Bancroft's objections should accordingly be denied.

To the extent Bancroft may contend that the counterclaims are subject to dismissal for lack of standing or failure to state a claim, the court's ruling on joinder is without prejudice to the assertion of such arguments in a motion to dismiss. Furthermore, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 21, the court retains the authority to sever any party or claim should misjoinder later be shown.

To the extent Bancroft objects to defending against the same counterclaims in multiple forums, that may be grounds for consolidation or transfer but not denying joinder. The court also notes that Bancroft previously opposed FFD4's motion to transfer venue to the Southern District of Texas. Given subsequent developments and Bancroft's possible change in position, the parties may file renewed motions if they wish to have the issue reconsidered.

////

////

Case 3:11-cv-00214-LRH-WGC Document 67 Filed 01/25/12 Page 3 of 3

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant's Objections (#42)
2	are DENIED.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	DATED this 24th day of January, 2012.
5	Olden
6	
7	LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	